

AN

# EXAMINATION OF THE CLAIMS

OF

## OMNIGENY, AS A SYSTEM

OF

### MEDICAL DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE:

BEING A LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF  
LOUISVILLE ON THE 14th FEBRUARY, 1847

---

BY HENRY MILLER, M. D.

*Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children*

---

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY

Louisville, Ky.

PRINTED BY C. H. WOODBURY & CO.



AN

EXAMINATION OF THE CLAIMS

OF

HOMOEOPATHY, AS A SYSTEM

OF

MEDICAL DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE:

BEING A LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF  
LOUISVILLE ON THE 14th DECEMBER, 1847.

---

BY HENRY MILLER, M. D.

*Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children.*

---

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY.

22159  
[Louisville, Ky.]

PRINTED BY G. H. MONSARRAT & CO.

W/BK  
M648e  
1847

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

LOUISVILLE, Saturday, Nov. 6, 1847.

PROFESSOR MILLER—DEAR SIR:

We esteem it a great pleasure to be the medium of communicating to you the unanimous desire of the members of the Louisville Medical Society, that you should deliver before them on next Friday evening, the address prepared by you as an introductory. Hoping that you will find it convenient to gratify them,

We remain yours, &c.,

R. J. BRECKENRIDGE,  
ROBERT B. SMITH,  
G. W. BURKE,  
Committee for Medical Society.

---

LOUISVILLE, Nov. 9, 1847.

GENTLEMEN:

In answer to your note of the 6th instant, communicating the request of the Louisville Medical Society, that I would deliver before it, on next Friday evening, the lecture prepared by me for an Introductory, I have to say that although I would have preferred reserving it till the recurrence of another occasion, such as the one for which it was intended, I do not feel at liberty to refuse the *unanimous* wishes of so large a portion of the Medical Class as composes your Society.

You may, therefore, inform the Society that I will, Providence permitting, deliver the Lecture at the time specified. I will only add that as it was intended for the public as well as the profession, it will be agreeable to me to have the public invited, and also, the Faculty and Class, and I have no objection to the subject (Homœopathy) being announced.

I am, gentlemen,

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant.

H. MILLER.

To Messrs. Robert J. Breckenridge, Robert B. Smith, G. W. Burke, Committee

LOUISVILLE, MEDICAL HALL, Dec. 18, 1847.

PROFESSOR MILLER—DEAR SIR:

The undersigned have been appointed, by the Medical Society of Louisville, a committee to request a copy of your Lecture on Homœopathy, read before the Society a few evenings since, for publication.

In discharging this pleasing duty we are glad of an opportunity of assuring you of the great regard with which we are,

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servants.

H. W. ECTOR, Georgia,  
N. B. ANDERSON, Kentucky,  
W. W. YANDELL, Tennessee,  
H. H. HUNTER, Mississippi,  
WM. TAYLOR, Alabama.  
A. E. GORE, Missouri.

P. S. The Society desires an answer at as early a day as possible.

---

LOUISVILLE, Dec. 21, 1847.

GENTLEMEN:

Your note of the 18th instant, was received on the day of its date, and although I have not found it convenient to reply to it as promptly as you requested, the delay has not arisen from any hesitation to comply with the wishes of the Medical Society of Louisville, so acceptably expressed by you as its committee. Whatever may be my own opinion of the merits or defects of the Lecture, which I had the pleasure to read before the Society, I cheerfully acquiesce in the resolution to publish it, and transmit herewith a copy.

Be pleased to make my acknowledgments to the Society for this mark of its favorable approval, and allow me to subscribe myself, gentlemen,

Your friend.

H. MILLER.

To Messrs. H. W. Ector, Georgia; N. B. Anderson, Kentucky; W. W. Yandell, Tennessee; H. H. Hunter, Mississippi; Wm. Taylor, Alabama; A. E. Gore, Missouri, Committee.

# LECTURE.

---

The lecture which I shall have the honor to deliver before the Medical Society, and the guests assembled by its invitation, was prepared for an Introductory, but its delivery was prevented by domestic affliction, which a kind and merciful providence has healed. On such occasions as that for which the lecture was intended, the public are invited to meet the Medical Faculty and pupils of our school, and have, therefore, a right to expect a discourse, so far divested of professional technicality and abstruseness as to be level to their comprehension. If the subject of it be one involving deeply the public welfare, it will be entitled to their more serious and candid consideration, and we shall have performed a task, which may prove both interesting and profitable.

Influenced by such views, I propose in this lecture, to institute an "Inquiry into the claims of Homœopathy, as a System of Medical Doctrine and Practice."

It has occurred to me that such an inquiry is the more necessary at this time, on account of an article, which appeared last year, in the BRITISH AND FOREIGN REVIEW, entitled "HOMŒOPATHY, ALLOPATHY, AND YOUNG PHYSIC," in which the writer, Dr. Forbes, the accomplished editor of that journal, is thought to have expressed more commendation of Homœopathy than it deserves. It was evidently the object of the writer to induce physicians to institute a closer scrutiny into the remedial powers actually exerted by the various medicines in common use, by showing that unaided nature is competent to the cure of many diseases and is often entitled to the credit usurped by them. Whatever praises are bestowed by him on Homœopathy are really intended for the *vis medicatrix* or healing power of nature, to which is ascribed all the efficacy. Notwithstanding this dubious praise, however, great offence has been taken by regular physicians, and great exultation has been indulged by Homœopaths, on account of the famous article in question, which has been published in pamphlet form, and widely circulated by self-styled *Reformers* of every hue and grade.

The sketch of Homœopathy, which I shall draw, is taken from an original picture by SAMUEL CHRISTIAN FREDERIC HAHNEMANN, the author of it, and is contained in his work, entitled "THE HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL DOCTRINE, OR ORGANON OF THE HEALING ART," translated from the German by Charles H. Devrient, Esq., with notes by Samuel Stratten, M. D., of Dublin. From Dr. Stratten's preface, as well as other authentic sources, we learn that the celebrated discoverer and founder of the Homœopathic System of Medicine early exhib-



ited traits of superior genius, and prosecuted the study of medicine at Leipsic and other Universities, in the latter part of the last century.— He soon became disgusted with the mass of contradictory assertions and theories which then existed in medicine, so that he was on the point of abandoning the medical profession and retiring in disgust, as we say. Restrained from flying off at a tangent, however, doubtless by a kind of presentiment of the brilliant discovery that awaited him, he determined, in 1790, to translate into his native language the *Materia Medica* of the illustrious Cullen. Somehow or other, he became *fired* (that is the phrase used by his biographers to express the zeal that consumed him) with the desire of ascertaining the mode of action of Cinchona bark, in the cure of fevers, and forthwith, while in the most robust health, he commenced the use of this substance, and in a short time, was rewarded with a regular paroxysm of intermittent fever. Ordinary mortals, if they wished to learn the virtues of Cinchona as a febrifuge would have contented themselves with administering it to the sick and watching its effects; but our Samuel, having resolved to probe the matter to the bottom, fell to taking it himself greedily, while in lusty health. Again; a plodding doctor, could he have conceived the idea of taking the bark while in health, to discover how it cures the sick, would have cursed the nauseous stuff for giving him the ague, and there would have been the end on it. Not so with the perspicacious Hahnemann; while his mortal body was shivering with the chill, engendered by his bold and original adventure, the germ of the new theory was deposited in his mind, and found a congenial soil. If Cinchona bark, administered to a person in health, is capable of producing intermittent fever, it must, he argued, eradicate the disease taken in the natural way, by exciting an analogous disease which takes its place, but which, being medicinal, speedily subsides and leaves the organism in health. From this and other experiments, he deduced the great remedial law, *similia similibus curentur*, or like cures like, which is the foundation of his doctrine, and from which is derived its distinctive title of *Homœopathic*.

The Homœopathic doctrine, as expounded in the *Organon*, is couched in no less than two hundred and ninety-two aphorisms; but its distinguishing features may be exhibited in a few propositions:

1. Every malady pre-supposes some change in the interior of the human economy, whose essence is wholly undiscoverable, because it is purely a dynamic change of the vital powers in regard to the manner in which they accomplish sensation and action.

2. These aberrations which our *spiritual* existence undergoes in its mode of feeling and acting, of which we can have but a vague and dark conception, reflect their image externally in the symptoms by which they are attended, and these symptoms are all we can ever hope to discover. The symptoms are, moreover, so closely connected with the disease, that when the totality of them is destroyed, the disease also is annihilated.

3. Medicines possess spiritual virtues, by which they can modify



the state of the human body, in a curative manner, which is effected by their exciting morbid symptoms of a very decided character,—the only possible manifestation of their remedial virtues. They all operate by producing a certain *artificial* disease, which destroys the previous symptoms, that is to say, the *natural* disease which, says Hahnemann, they intend to cure.

4. Medicines operate in a curative manner only when they excite artificial maladies resembling as nearly as possible the natural ones for which they are administered. Their curative powers are, therefore, grounded upon the faculty which they possess of creating symptoms similar to those of the disease itself, but which are of a more intense nature.

5. Diseases that are *moderately* acute may get well by the unaided efforts of self-helping nature, the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, as it is called by others; “the reviving vital powers gradually substitute the normal state in the place of the in-normal, which by degrees is become weakened.” “But,” as Hahnemann declares, “in every acute disease, and in those that are chronic, which constitute the great majority of the diseases to which man is subject, this resource no longer comes to the aid of simple nature and the old school of medicine.—The efforts of the vital powers, and the imitative attempts of Allopathy are not potent enough to effect a resolution; and all that results from them is a truce of short duration, during which the enemy gathers his forces to re-appear sooner or later in a more formidable shape than ever.”

6. The doses of medicines that are truly Homœopathic should be attenuated to such a degree that they shall merely produce an almost insensible aggravation of the disease. “It is of little import,” saith the Organon, “whether the attenuation goes so far as to appear almost impossible to ordinary physicians whose minds feed on no other ideas but what are gross and material. All their arguments and vain assertions will be of little avail when opposed to the dictates of unerring experience.”

7. Chronic diseases, which, after all, are the greatest and most frequent scourges of the human species, are produced by chronic miasms, which make continual progress in the body, when no specific curative remedy is opposed to them. Of these chronic miasms, that of *psora* or the itch is incomparably the greatest and most important; it is an ancient miasm, having been transmitted through the organism of millions of individuals in the course of some hundreds of generations, and when the whole body is infected by it, a cutaneous eruption that is wholly peculiar to it makes its appearance, accompanied by insupportable itching and a specific odor. “This psora is the true and fundamental cause that produces all the other countless forms of disease which, under the names of *nervous debility, hysteria, hypochondriasis, insanity, melancholy, idiocy, madness, epilepsy, and spasms of all kinds, softening of the bones, or rickets, distortion and curvature of the spine, caries, cancer, fungus hematodes, gout,*

*hæmorrhoids, yellow jaundice and the blue disorder, dropsy, amenorrhœa, gastrorrhagia, epistaxis, hæmoptysis, hæmaturia, metrorrhagia, asthma and suppuration of the lungs, &c., &c., appear in our pathology as so many peculiar, distinct and independent diseases."*

The strictures which we shall offer upon the Homœopathic system of medicine, will be in the form of commentaries on these several propositions.

Proposition first asserts the recondite nature of disease, alleging that its essence is wholly inscrutable, because it consists in the disturbance of the vital powers whose essence is equally inscrutable, being forever veiled in "the interior of the human economy." This proposition rests upon an assumption, namely, that the phenomena of life are produced by a something superadded to matter, denominated "vital principle," "*vis vitæ*," or vital power, &c. To this presiding and governing principle are attributed the building up of the organisms of plants and animals in the first instance, as well as their future preservation, and to its departure are ascribed the dissolution of the fabrics which it had reared, and the scattering of their elementary ingredients. Now, this is purely theory, or hypothesis, there being no proof whatever that any such principle exists, separate and apart from the organised structure which it is supposed to vivify. All we know or can hope to know is, that certain kinds of matter, when placed in the requisite conditions, exhibit certain phenomena peculiar to life. These conditions are, a certain state of combination and arrangement termed organization, and the presence of the vital stimuli of light, heat, electricity, and moisture. The first of these conditions is derived from a pre-existent organization, and the second is diffused around us by Him, who formed the first beings of every kind, by his creative act, and endowed them with the power of perpetuating their several species. Reproduction, absorption, assimilation, secretion, nutrition, and growth—in a word, all the phenomena of life, except those of mind, may be regarded as *properties* of matter brought into the state of organization. To refer them to a vital principle no more explains them than the supposition of a subtle and elastic ether, pervading the spaces between the heavenly bodies, explains the phenomena of gravitation. We do not know how or why the sun exerts an attractive force upon the planets, binding them in their orbits, and causing them to revolve around him; neither do we know how or why an organized arrangement of the materials of our frame confers on these materials powers which they did not before possess, or which were latent. In both cases, we perceive nothing but innate properties of matter, the existence of which must be ascribed to the will of the Creator.

But we need not dwell upon the doctrine of a vital principle, for it is not peculiar to the system of Hahnemann, he having only refined by spiritualizing it, and shrouding it in as much mystery as possible, to adapt it to the other dogmas which he held. Thus, according to that embraced in our second proposition, we can never hope to ob-

tain even a glimpse of disease, *in propria persona*, but must rest satisfied with its *image*, reflected externally in what are called symptoms. These symptoms are, however, it may be presumed, a pretty accurate likeness of the mysterious original, and are closely identified with it, since if they are destroyed, it also perishes. In harmony with this dogma, Hahnemann lays great stress upon the necessity of carefully collecting the symptoms, as they flow fresh and undiluted from the patient's mouth, and keeping an accurate registry of them in his own veracious language. He is particular to direct that the physician shall first listen to the patient's rehearsal of his symptoms, and then proceed to question him, avoiding the putting of any question in such a manner as may bias his answers. To show the nature of this catechizing, he gives a formula, a part of which I shall transcribe for your learning.

"Is there any peculiarity in the state of the patient when he sleeps? Does he sigh, moan, speak, or cry out? Does he start in his sleep? Does he snore in inspiration or expiration? Does he lie on his back only, or on which side does he lay himself? Does he cover himself up close, or does he throw off the bed-covering? Does he easily awake, or does he sleep soundly? How does he feel on waking? How often does this or that circumstance occur, and on what occasion? Is it when the patient is sitting up, lying down, standing up, or when he is moving about? Does it come on merely when he has been fasting, or at least early in the morning, or simply in the evening, or after food? When did the shivering come on? Was it merely a sensation of cold, or was he actually cold at the time? In what part of the body did the patient feel cold? Was his skin warm when he complained of being cold? Did he experience a sensation of cold without shivering? Did he feel heat without the face being flushed? What parts of the body were warm to the touch? Did the patient complain of heat without his skin being warm? How long did the sensation of cold or that of heat continue? When did the thirst come on? During the cold or heat? Or was it before or after? Was the thirst intense? What did the patient ask for to drink? When did the perspiration come on? Was it at the commencement or at the expiration of the heat? What space of time elapsed between the heat and perspiration? Was it when sleeping or waking that it manifested itself? Was it strong or otherwise? Was the perspiration hot or cold? In what parts of the body did it break out? How did it smell? What did the patient complain of before or during the cold, during or after the heat, during or after the perspiration?"\* &c.

The totality of the symptoms, or in other words, the image of the disease being once committed to writing, the most difficult part is accomplished; this image must ever be before the physician's eyes to serve as the basis of the treatment. He must oppose to these symptoms, that is to say, *to the disease itself*, Hahnemann acutely remarks, a remedy that is perfectly Homœopathic, or which produces, by its simple action on the body, morbid symptoms resembling those of the disease itself. Should it happen that a perfectly Homœopathic remedy cannot be found, that is, one which can cover the whole ground of the symptoms, then he is to select that which comes the nearest, and having demolished a part of the symptoms with it, he is to consider the altered image of the disease, and direct

another remedy accordingly—in this way, eradicating the disease by slaying one group of symptoms after another.

Such is a fair and sufficiently full account of Hahnemann's views of the nature of disease, and the method of extirpating it by the administration of remedies. Can any thing be imagined more puerile in itself, or more humiliating and degrading to the medical profession? To gather and record the symptoms of disease, in the manner and for the purposes prescribed by him, would be a vain and frivolous task, suited to the taste and capacity of an inquisitive old lady, but wholly unproductive of useful results. A garrulous old woman could, in sooth, succeed in extracting a greater number of symptoms from the sick than the most learned physician that ever lived, and by looking into a Homœopathic manual of the *materia medica pura*, she could as easily find the proper medicine to upset them; for the whole art is reduced to the precision of a game of nine-pins.

Symptoms have no significancy, and are of no value, unless we can connect them with the internal or external lessons which produce them. They are but the signals of distress, hung out by nature, and unless we are able rightly to interpret them, and be led by them to a knowledge of the seat and nature of the disease, we shall never be the wiser for considering them, nor will the sick be profited by our gossiping visits. By the *nature* of diseases I mean, not the intimate alterations which an imaginary vital principle may undergo, but the altered state of organization induced by disease, and the mischief that is to be apprehended from such organic alterations. With some of these morbid states we are well acquainted, particularly with the inflammatory, which exists in so large a proportion of diseases; our knowledge of others is not so perfect, while in some—in neuralgic affections, for example—our means of investigation have not as yet enabled us to discover any organic alterations, although there can be no doubt of their existence.

The discovery of the nature of disease, in the sense in which I have thus briefly defined it, is an object of paramount importance to the physician, as the only solid basis of the treatment he is to pursue, and, if he fail in it, he is like a mariner without chart or compass, and is in danger of making shipwreck of his patient. Symptoms may sometimes be so well marked as to disclose both the nature and seat of the disease, but not unfrequently they are vague, equivocal, and bewildering, and mock our most strenuous attempts to penetrate the disguise they wear. Diseases essentially different may have symptoms so much alike, as easily to lead him, who is guided by their light alone, to fatal errors of diagnosis and practice. Fortunately, the true physician is not doomed to wander in the twilight of symptoms; he seeks the aid of physical diagnosis, illuminated by morbid anatomy, and may thus acquire a knowledge of internal diseases, no matter how deeply concealed in the “interior of the economy,” as precise and satisfactory as that of external affections which fall under the immediate cognizance of his senses. The use of the



stethoscope and other means of investigation, familiar to the accomplished physician, and the study of morbid anatomy, have done more towards making us acquainted with the nature of diseases, than the observation of symptoms alone, for thousands of years, could have achieved. But such modes of investigation are inconsistent with the genius and spirit of Homœopathic medicine, unless indeed we allow the extraordinary latitude, claimed for symptoms, by Professor Henderson, of Edinburgh, who has fallen from the orthodox faith, and is now one of the most zealous advocates for what he calls Homœopathy, but which is, in fact, mongrel medicine. In answering the objection, that, in prescribing by the guidance of symptoms, regardless of the seat and nature of the disorder to be cured, the Homœopathist is in danger of overlooking conditions of the most serious kind, Professor Henderson pleads that the "nature of a disease" (using the phrase in the sense already defined) "constitutes a portion of that picture of sensible effects, (imperfectly expressed by the term symptoms,) which result usually from the secret, and, as he thinks, inscrutable condition of the body, which is their proximate cause." "The study of morbid anatomy and of diagnosis, in many instances," Prof. H. continues, "enables the physician to determine, without seeing them, the existence in an internal organ of an assemblage of conditions essentially the same as those which are often witnessed in external parts by the eye; and if the latter be of any consequence to him in guiding his practice, it would be absurd to suppose that the circumstance of these conditions existing in a part unseen, would deprive them of importance, or render the methods by which they can be ascertained to exist of no practical value. If redness, swelling, and effusion," he further urges, "are additions to the pain and heat of erysipelas, highly important in prescribing, how can it be otherwise with the like conditions of the parts concerned in inflammation of the lungs or of the bowels? There are indications by which those states of the viscera may be almost as accurately ascertained to exist as if they were seen by the eye; and of these the Homœopathist is quite as cognizant as the ordinary physician, and holds them in certainly not less estimation."\*

It is highly disingenuous in Prof. H. to pretend that writers on Homœopathy, especially its founder, mean more by the term, symptoms, than other medical writers; if they do, how easy would it have been for them to have defined their meaning. Neither such definition nor the remotest allusion to morbid conditions of internal organs, of a nature that can be at all appreciated, is to be found anywhere in the pages of the "Organon." Such a latitudinarian employment of the term, symptom, would be absurd. A sudden loss of sensibility and voluntary motion, stertorous breathing, &c., are *symptoms* of apo-

---

\*Inquiry into the Homœopathic Practice of Medicine, p. 23.

plexy, which consists in extravasation of blood upon the surface or in the substance of the brain. To say that the clot of blood, pressing on the brain and interrupting its functions, is also a symptom of apoplexy, would be a gross abuse of language, for it is an essential element of the disease itself, and could never have been discovered but by the examination of the body after death. Prof. Henderson admits that the disciples of the Homœopathic School are not much addicted to researches of this kind, or over-curious in prying into the state of our inward parts. But this is the fault, I should rather say, the incurable defect, of the system he is advocating, which would doubtless have been exemplified in his own person, had he been converted to Homœopathy before he was promoted, unworthily we cannot help suspecting, to the chair of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh. Pathology or the doctrines of morbid action, I repeat, can be of no use to a Homœopathist: give him symptoms that he may form a "faithful image" of the disease he is to demolish; and if it withstand the fire of his small arms, it must be less vulnerable than even a witch, who was never yet known to survive the perforation of her *image* by a silver bullet.

The third proposition, viz: that natural diseases can only be overcome by artificial ones, excited by the remedies employed by the physician, is not destitute of a coloring of truth. Some of our most valuable medicines are violent poisons, and are, of course, capable of exciting morbid symptoms, of a very decided character; but it may well be denied that even these act thus virulently, when properly exhibited, while of others it may be confidently affirmed, that their tendency is to produce no morbid symptoms whatever, but on the contrary, directly to allay them. The continued exhibition of the various preparations of iron, for example, in cachectic and anæmic states of the system, is productive of no disturbance of any function; but on the contrary, all the functions are invigorated and even the blood is enriched. Under their sanative influence, the skin, as if touched by the wand of the magician, loses its sickly hue, its capillary vessels are swelled with the crimson currents of life, and the roses of health again bloom upon the cheeks. The abstraction of blood, on the other hand, exerts a direct and powerful control over inflammatory affections, and, if it do not immediately arrest, disarms them of their power to disorganize and destroy. This saving influence of blood-letting is manifested without the intervention of any morbid symptoms;—the quantity of the circulating fluids is simply diminished, the morbid action of the heart and arteries lowered, and the vessels of the inflamed part are thus enabled to recover their healthy equilibrium and tone.

I know that blood-letting, which I have instanced as a remedial agent that cures without sickening, is denounced by Hahnemann, as a measure which "nothing can justify." Even in the most acute

pleurisy, he alleges, the sole and true cause of the malady is "a dynamic inflammatory irritation of the vascular system," that may be permanently and speedily cured by one or two extremely weak doses of the juice of aconite, which is Homœopathic with this irritation. Does he mean that aconite can cause pleurisy? It is not a little singular that the denunciation of blood-letting is the rallying point of all pretended reformers in medicine; here they all meet and cordially embrace,—Thompsonians, Chronothermalists, Homœopathists, Hydropathists, and all the motley crew. However widely they may differ on other points of faith, though one may be for expelling a fever by heating the furnaces of the body till they glow with red pepper, and another avow his confidence in the efficacy of drenching it with cold water, they agree that the blood shall be spared. The experience of physicians in all ages, as well as the common sense of mankind, has established the value of blood-letting on so secure a basis that it cannot be shaken by the puny assaults of its adversaries. It may, nevertheless, be admitted that, like every other real blessing, it may be easily converted into a curse, and it must, therefore, be deemed a fortunate coincidence, that men, who plainly evince their incapacity to make a sober use of it, by their vagaries on other subjects, should agree to have nothing to do with leech or lancet. It should be stated in justice to Prof. Henderson, of Homœopathic memory, that he acknowledges the indispensable necessity of blood-letting, in certain diseases, (and hence the epithet "mongrel," which I have applied to his Homœopathy) but then he confers on it no higher dignity than that of a "mechanical expedient."

To ascertain the morbid effects and consequently the curative powers of different medicines, it is necessary, according to Hahnemann, to have recourse to experiments on healthy individuals. During the whole time of the experiment, the diet must be very moderate, spices should be abstained from, as much as possible, all green vegetables, save green peas, French beans and carrots, must be carefully avoided, and no herbs should flavor the soups that may be ingurgitated, because notwithstanding the preparations they may have undergone, these are aliments that still retain some small medicinal energy that disturbs the effect of the medicine." The person on whom the experiment is tried ought to avoid all fatiguing labor of body or mind and be scrupulously attentive to everything that passes in the interior of the body: "all the sensations, inconveniences, symptoms, and changes" experienced are to be noted down with perspicuity, and the utmost care must be taken not to confound accidental feelings with those which are the pure effects of the medicine. Hahnemann thinks it greatly preferable that physicians should perform these experiments on their own persons. for, says he, "a thing is never more certain than when it has been tried on ourselves," and they thus acquire, moreover, a conviction of this great truth, that "*the curative*



virtues of medicines depend solely upon the power they possess of creating changes in the physical economy of man!—a truth that was hid for ages, but revealed to Samuel Christian Frederick Hahnemann. Oh! fortunate Samuel! repeat to us the astounding truth, and speak in still plainer language that we may never forget it: *if medicines produced no effect on man, they could not cure his diseases*; now we comprehend it perfectly,—nothing can be expected from nothing!

By other equally urgent considerations, Hahnemann presses the duty of physicians experimenting on themselves, and he assures them that they need not apprehend the slightest detriment to their health, but on the contrary their bodies will be rendered more apt to repel all natural and artificial morbid causes, and become hardened against their influence. Their health will become more firm and their bodies more robust. These assurances would hardly allay our natural dread of danger, or conquer our excusable aversion for swallowing physic, had not Hahnemann luckily found out that it is preferable to take *only doses that are very weak and extenuated to a very high degree*, because, says he, *it is in this form that the virtues of medical agents are the most developed*. Whether extenuation increases the virtues of medicines or not, we shall presently inquire, but all will agree that it wonderfully conduces to the pleasure of the experiment. Hahnemann claims the credit of having been the first to make it a chief and important study to find out the principal and pure effects of medicines: for a while he was alone in his glory; subsequently he was aided by some young practitioners, and now his disciples in Germany are industriously engaged in these *provings*: whether or not American Homœopathists are treading in the footsteps of their master, we are not informed.

If it can be shown that medicines do not produce one disease to cure another, it is scarcely worth while to inquire into the *likeness* of medicinal diseases, in order to see whether or not they resemble their antagonists; as it is declared they must, by the terms of the fourth proposition; for whatever else may be doubtful, it is certain that if these medicinal diseases have no existence, in the process of cure, they have no particular likeness. As, however, the great Homœopathic law, *similia similibus curentur*, is couched in this fourth proposition, it should not be so unceremoniously dismissed. According to this law, in the language of Hahnemann, “a dynamic disease in the living economy of man is extinguished, in a permanent manner, by another that is more powerful, when the latter, without being of the same species, bears a strong resemblance to it in its mode of manifesting itself.” Both physical and moral diseases are cured in the same manner, and the following are some of the illustrations given by him to exemplify it: the brilliant planet Jupiter disappears in the twilight from the eyes of him that gazes at it, because the light of breaking day then acts upon these organs; the olfactory nerves, when of-

fended by disagreeable odors, are flattered by snuff, which affects the nose in a similar manner but more powerfully; the deep-mouthed clamor of the big drum drowns the distant roar of the enemy's cannon, which carries terror to the heart of the soldier; and mourning and sadness are extinguished in the soul by the news of still greater misfortunes occurring to another.

Many examples might be adduced, as Hahnemann thinks, where nature has cured diseases Homœopathically by other diseases which excited similar symptoms. But to confine himself to precise and indisputable facts, he instances only a few diseases that arise from some permanent miasm and constantly preserve their identity, such as the small-pox, cow-pock, and measles. Among the diseases thus cured by the small-pox, "so famous for the number and violence of its symptoms," he mentions *chronic ophthalmia, blindness, deafness, and dysentery*; all of which affections are known to be very usual symptoms or consequences of small-pox. Troublesome and long standing *cutaneous eruptions* are not unfrequently cured by the measles and cow-pock, and it is well known that an eruption of the skin is a conspicuous symptom of these diseases. The facts adduced by Hahnemann, collected as they were from various authors, are entitled to our faith, but the legitimacy of the use he makes of them may well be questioned. It is no proof that small-pox cures ophthalmia Homœopathically, because inflammation of the eyes is among the great number of local affections that *may* attend the disease; it should be shown, also, that in the particular cases in which such a cure of ophthalmia has been performed, variolous inflammation of the eyes existed in a decided degree. Inflammation of the eyes is liable to attend or follow measles, as well as small-pox, and an instance fell under my own observation in which manifest amelioration of chronic strumous ophthalmia followed an attack of measles, but in this case certainly, there was no inflammation of the eyes as an accompaniment of the disease. With regard to the cure of cutaneous eruptions by measles and cow-pock, all that can be said is, that one cutaneous disease is expelled by another; there being no other resemblance between them than the circumstance of the skin being their common seat, and, of course, the Homœopathic principle will not apply, unless the eruptive disorders themselves are analogous.

As diseases can only be cured in conformity with the Homœopathic law, Hahnemann maintains that nature is exceedingly restricted in her resources, having no other agents at her command than the miasmatic diseases, which have been mentioned, save the all-pervading psora; but, as he truly says, these morbid powers are more dangerous and terrific than the maladies which they cure, and their use, as Homœopathic remedies is, therefore, difficult, uncertain and dangerous. What then? Must ill-fated mortals patiently bear all the diseases that may assail them, or be swept to the grave, in countless

swarms, with no eye to pity and no arm to save? Oh! no; Hahnemann has discovered, in numerous herbs and minerals, properties exactly adapting them to the deplorable exigency, namely, power to produce artificial diseases closely resembling natural ones, and at the same time rather stronger, whereby the former are enabled to substitute themselves in the place of the latter and entirely obliterate them: "the stronger, says Hahnemann, annihilates the weaker," nor is it difficult, in his estimation, to conceive how this is performed; "as soon as the vital powers, which have till then been deranged by a morbid cause, are attacked with greater energy by a new power very analogous to the former but more intense, they no longer receive any impression but from the latter, while the preceding one, reduced to a state of mere dynamic power without matter, must cease to exist" This attempted explanation, it will be easily perceived, is nothing but a *petitio principii*,—the asserted fact and the explanation are substantially the same, and we are enlightened by it precisely in the same degree as when we are told that opium causes sleep, because it possesses a soporific power.

The Homœopathic law, supposing it to be true, offers some very curious phenomena:

1. In the kingdom of diseases, contrary to what obtains in the animal kingdom, strife exists among those of a homogeneous nature, while such as are heterogeneous live in concord in the same tabernacle, even in the frail body of man,—for we are told by Hahnemann that not only may *dissimilar* diseases exist, at the same time in one body, the weaker, being sometimes quiet while the stronger are running their career, but they may enter into a compact and parcel out the organs, so that each may have its separate jurisdiction.

2. Strong diseases, especially those excited by remedies, are more merciful than weak ones, for, after having gained the ascendancy, they peaceably and promptly retire, leaving the vital principle in a healthy condition. But this, we may suppose, is to be accounted for by the speedy dissolution of the artificial disease, caused by the collision with its antagonist, for, saith Hahnemann, they "always mutually destroy each other when they meet together in the system."

But notwithstanding our inability to unfold the rationale of it, and maugre its curious operation, the Homœopathic law is entitled to our reverence, if it be, indeed, as its great discoverer and expounder pronounced it, "the eternal and irrevocable law of nature;" and whether or not this is its character can only be settled by an appeal to observation. Waving any inquiry, then, into the accuracy of the *provings* of Homœopaths, in relation to all other articles of the materia medica, we offer them an issue which they cannot decently reject; if it can be *proved* that quinine, administered to healthy individuals, in such doses as are known to be sufficient to cure intermit-

tent fever and various neuralgic diseases, will produce, with equal certainty, analogous morbid states, the truth of Homœopathy shall never again be called in question. The issue tendered must be considered a fair one, for, as we have seen, it was the alleged power of the bark, whose active principle is quinine, to produce symptoms resembling intermittent fever, that first suggested to Hahnemann the Homœopathic theory of medicine.

The fifth proposition, which proclaims the impotence or hurtful tendency of the natural efforts of the system to free itself from disease, and also the pernicious tendency of the imitative efforts of Allopathy, will be briefly examined in reference to the truth of both of these allegations. And, first, as to the efficacy of the natural efforts or the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, as it is technically called, to cure diseases, what need be said to vindicate it from the aspersion cast upon it by Hahnemann? Why, such a power is as essentially inherent in organization as life itself, nay, life would be no longer life without it.—Living beings are liable to accidents and injuries of a thousand kinds as well as to diseases, and by these, parts of their organization may be deranged, mutilated, and destroyed, at any moment of their existence. Without a self-preservative and self-restorative power, they could not maintain their existence in a world constituted as ours is, or they would soon become hideous spectacles of misery and deformity. A bone is broken or shattered, who is to mend it? The surgeon, do you answer? But to how many human beings, to say nothing of the inferior creatures, does this accident happen, who are not in reach of a surgeon? And when the surgeon is called, he cannot mend or repair the mischief; his agency is comparatively trifling; he can bring the parts into coaptation and enjoin rest, but nature must provide the only cement that can knit them together and consolidate their union by conversion of this cement into bone. A wound is received in a fleshy part, how is it to be healed? The surgeon can close it by stitches and plaster, but the *vis medicatrix* must accomplish the work of reparation, else the wound will continue to gape for life, as often as the appliances of art are removed. It is observable, moreover, that the reparatory processes are most completely successful, when they are the least interfered with by the surgeon, who now knows that, although in former times, they had their sarcotic or *flesh-creating* ointments and *healing* cerates, the most simple cold-water dressing is more agreeable to nature, and far more useful than all the ointments of the apothecary.

In these surgical affections, we see the operations of the restorative power; it is not less really and efficaciously employed in internal diseases, from the slightest cold to the most raging fever, and without it, no cure could ever take place, for it is not in the power of medicine to institute restorative processes,—it can only promote them. These processes are various: sometimes they are open to inspection and



court our observation, but not unfrequently they elude our closest scrutiny, or are only partially exhibited. Nature may cure one disease by producing another, or, as it has been expressed, *by converting one disease into another*:—vomiting, for example, may be arrested by the occurrence of diarrhœa or a rash on the skin, dropsy may be cured by a diabetes or diarrhœa, a congestion of blood in the brain, threatening apoplexy, by an epistaxis or bleeding at the nose, &c., &c. Occult natural cures are remarkable for the rapidity with which they are performed; the most violent spasms suddenly relax, the most intense pain abruptly intermits, the most alarming syncope yields to the power of returning animation. Nature makes a systematic effort to get rid of all febrile diseases by what has been called, from the remotest antiquity, a *crisis*, that is, by an increased secretion of the skin or kidneys, through which the poison that had tainted the blood and perverted the various functions, is eliminated from the system. These *crises* are but imperfectly comprehended by us; it is not merely the increased discharge by the skin and kidneys that cures, but also the internal workings of the economy, detaching the morbid principle and preparing it for expulsion, else it could never be eliminated.

It would have been wonderful, if men had beheld phenomena such as these, for thousands of years, and yet never conceived the idea that their bodies, when invaded by disease, are gifted, to a limited extent, with the power of self-recuperation, and that, perchance, the wisest thing they could do, in many cases, would be to study and imitate this marvellous power. But such imitation is denounced by Hahnemann as impotent or mischievous: it is the odious *Allopathy* which Homœopathy is commissioned to destroy. We accept the appellation of Allopathists, so far as it is descriptive of our faith; but as it expresses only *one* of the principles, on which the ordinary and rational practice of medicine is based, we do not admit that it includes *all*. To prescribe Allopathically is, as the term imports, to act upon sound parts in order to divert the malady from those that are diseased, in imitation of the procedure sometimes adopted by nature.—It is acting, in other words, upon the well-known principle of *derivation*. The advantages accruing from practising on this principle are even greater, in the hands of art than of nature, and are confirmed by such accumulated experience that Homœopathy impugns it in vain. It is on this principle that blisters and sinapisms act in the relief and cure of many diseases, and none but the veritable Dr. Doubty himself can call in question their great efficacy and inestimable value.—Purgative medicines, of such general utility in the treatment of disease, often owe their beneficial effects to the same principle,—they succor organs, struggling with disease that threatens to overwhelm them, by diverting the morbid excitement to the intestines. In this case, it may be said, we only substitute one disease for another: be it

so; but who would not gladly exchange inflammation or congestion of the brain for a diarrhœa? Derivations to the skin scarcely deserve the name of disease; at all events, they are trivial, compared with the grave maladies they are adapted to relieve.

But, as already hinted, the regular physician is not limited to Allopathic medication, nor does he enforce it in all cases indiscriminately. His attacks are not unfrequently made on disease, in its very seat, as for example, in diseases of the skin and mucous membranes, and in the latter class of affections, his success has been greatly enhanced, in our own day, by improved methods of diagnosis and treatment.—The remedies applied in such cases are, in general, such as are, in his judgment, adapted to the nature of the disease,—the topical abstraction of blood, emollients, and sedatives, in acute inflammation or congestion, and in chronic inflammation, ulceration, &c., astringents, stimulants, escharotics,—in a word, such applications as are counter to the existing morbid state. In most fevers, on the other hand, which nature tends to cure by crisis, the regular physician, knowing the limits, the weakness, as well as the strength of his science, looks to the *vis medicatrix* for a cure, contenting himself with watching the progress of her operations, and being ever ready to remove unfavorable symptoms as they may arise. In such ministrations, he is the friend and ally of nature, nor does he claim any higher dignity or distinction; visionary theorists and reckless empirics may taunt him for his inactivity, but, if he adhere to his principles, he will be rewarded by a greater number of recoveries in his practice than they can boast. Our conviction of the value and success of this symptomatic treatment in fevers, and some other diseases cannot, therefore, be shaken by the fulmination of Hahnemann against what he calls the *antipathic, enantiopathic, or palliative* mode of employing medicines. Medicines of this kind are reprobated by him, ostensibly because they are intended to relieve but one symptom of disease, that of which the patient complains the loudest, but really because they are adverse to his theory and act upon the principle of *contraria contrariis* instead of *similia similibus*. To medicines of this class belongs opium, for example, which may be administered to soothe pain and procure sleep, and to contribute thus to the comfort of the sick; nay, it does more; pain and restlessness may positively aggravate the diseases, of which they are symptoms, and their removal is, therefore, not only palliative but curative in its influence. The same observation is applicable to other antipathics or palliatives;—to the use of cold water, for instance, for subduing preternatural heat, of laxatives to obviate constipation, of astringents to restrain inordinate discharges, &c.

The remedial influence of one of these, viz.: cold water, in certain febrile affections, (as we knew full well before Hydropathy was born) is so striking and undeniable that Homœopathy is now seek-

ing an alliance with it in Germany, and we have heard of a devout Homœopath in this city, who meditates a pilgrimage to its shrine at Graffenberg.

The sixth proposition, which we take up, not without that kind of awe which imagination sometimes inspires when we are alone in the dark, discloses the amazing activity of infinitesimal doses of medicines, even of such as have no power in the aggregate, provided their attenuation is obtained by a due observance of the mystic formula prescribed by Hahnemann. The mode of dilution and attenuation recommended by the great hierophant, in his Treatise on Chronic Diseases, we give as appended to his translation of the Organon, by Mr. Devrient, and is as follows:

"Of Homœopathic medicines, take one grain of those which are solid, (mercury *bei. g* included among the number) or one drop of those which are liquid; put this small quantity on about the third part of a hundred grains of pulverised sugar of milk in a porcelain capsule that is not glazed, then mix the medicine and sugar of milk together for a moment with a spatula of bone or horn, and pound the whole strongly during six minutes. The mass is then detached from the capsule and pestle during four minutes, in order that it may be perfectly homogeneous, and then rub down afresh during six minutes with equal force. Collect the whole of the powder into a body during four minutes, then add the second *third portion* of the sugar of milk, and mix the whole for an instant with a spatula, then triturate with force during six minutes. This is to be once more scraped together during four minutes, and rubbed down again for six minutes. Stir the whole together during four minutes, and add the last *third portion* of the sugar of milk, which is to be mixed by turning it about with the spatula; then triturate the mass powerfully during six minutes, scrape it together during four minutes, and the whole is finally to be rubbed down for six minutes. After the powder has been carefully detached from the capsule and pestle, put it into a phial, and let it be corked and labelled with the name of the substance, and the mark 100, which shows that the substance is in the hundredth degree of attenuation. To carry the medicine to the 10,000 degree of attenuation, take one grain of the powder marked 100, prepared as above, add the same to the third part of an hundred grains of pulverized sugar of milk, mix the whole in the capsule, and proceed in such manner, that after having triturated each third portion with force during six minutes, scrape the mass together during a space of four minutes. The powder when thus prepared is put into a well-corked bottle with the figures 10,000 marked on the exterior, which will point out the degree of its attenuation."

"The same method is observed when this second powder marked 10,000, is to be carried to the millionth degree of attenuation." To obtain other and higher attenuations, solutions in alcohol and water are resorted to; in the first place, one hundred drops of pure alcohol and one hundred drops of distilled water are mixed together with *ten shakes of the arm*, and one hundred drops of the mixture are poured upon one grain of the third or millionth attenuation in a phial, which is made to dissolve by slowly turning the phial round on its axis, when it is to be *twice shaken*. The subsequent dilutions or attenuations are formed by adding one drop of the preceding to ninety-nine drops of pure alcohol, and giving the phial containing them *two shakes*; in this manner are obtained the billionth, trillionth, quadrillionth, quin-



tillionth, sextillionth, septillionth, octillionth, nonillionth, and decillionth degrees of attenuation—one drop of the solution, in the last, containing of course only the *tenmillionth* of a grain or drop of the medicine! The medicines thus prepared are not administered in boluses, but on little globules of sugar of milk, two hundred of which weigh but a grain, and which are imbued with their virtues, by being moistened with the proper attenuation, by a touch of the stopper of the phial containing it. The pregnant globules are preserved dry in stoppered phials, to be taken in such numbers and at such times as may be prescribed.

On the Hahnemannian formulary, several observations are to be made: First. The duration of the different *rubblings* and *scrapings*, and the number of *shakes* to which the medicaments are to be subjected, are definitely prescribed and must be rigidly observed. The reason assigned for this is, that these operations have the power of wonderfully developing the inherent virtues of medicinal substances, which was unknown till Hahnemann's time, but which is so energetic that he tells us that he was forced by experience to reduce the number of shakes to two instead of ten, which he formerly prescribed to each dilution.

We find some difficulty in believing that rubbing and shaking have the remarkable power ascribed to them, because these manipulations are not peculiar to Homœopathic pharmacy, as we happen to know full well, for we cannot easily forget the hard ridge of our own dexter palm, when we were conversant with pestle and mortar. Besides, if shaking be so potent, how happens it that multitudes are not daily destroyed, in ordinary practice, for, in addition to the shaking which the doctor gives to medicines before they leave his shop, they are shaken not a little in being conveyed to the sick, and are often directed "to be well-shaken before taken;" ah! how fortunate, that stupid nurses sometimes mistake the direction, and only shake the patient! Secondly. We cannot sufficiently admire the innate, diffusive, and indestructible activity of medicinal substances. The millionth of a grain appears to our gross perceptivity a very small dose to produce any appreciable effect on the most sensitive body; the decillionth of a grain we can hardly reach, by even a mental process of disintegration; how are we utterly confounded, then, when we look at the little globules of sugar of milk, three hundred of which, we are told by Hahnemann, imbibe only one drop of an alcoholic solution! In swallowing one of these globules, impregnated with the highest attenuation, we get, therefore the *threehundredth part of the tenmillionth of a grain of medicine!*

Supposing the medicine to be the most active known to us, veratrum, strychnine, prussic acid, anything you please, we confess our total inability to believe that any virtue can adhere to it when thus

extenuated, if indeed it be susceptible of such extenuation; but when the medicine in hand is oyster-shell, in much repute with Homœopaths, under the name of *calcareæ*, which may be swallowed in ounces or pounds, with no other than mechanical inconvenience, and we are called on to believe that it can produce hundreds of symptoms, and continue to operate for forty or fifty days, we begin to suspect that it is only a cunning device to ascertain whether we are fit subjects for bedlam. But as if not satisfied with the *reductio ad absurdum*, which he brought upon his infinitesimal doses, enveloped in globules, Hahnemann gravely alleges that if the patient is very sensitive, and it is necessary to employ the smallest dose possible, and attain at the same time the most speedy results, it will be sufficient to let him smell once to a phial that contains a globule the size of a mustard-seed, imbibing the medicinal liquid attenuated to a very high degree. After the patient has smelled to it, the phial is to be re-corked, which will thus serve for years, *without its medicinal virtues being perceptibly impaired.*" If this be not stark nonsense, what is?

Two considerations are adduced by Hahnemann, apparently for the purpose of giving credibility to his infinitesimal doses: The first is the pretended discovery that the effect of medicines is not diminished in proportion to the diminution of the dose; and the second is the great, not to say *infinite* susceptibility of diseased parts to be acted upon by remedies that are Homœopathic, that is, which produce symptoms resembling those of the disease. With regard to the first, he affects to have discovered that a single drop of a mixture, composed of one drop of a tincture, and ten of a liquid, void of all medicinal properties, does not produce ten times the effect that a drop ten times more attenuated would produce, but merely an effect that is scarcely double. Admitting the existence of such a law of progression, of which there is not, however, any satisfactory proof, and all analogy is against it, it appears to us that all medicinal virtue must be washed away before the substance reaches its extreme dilution.

The other aid to his Liliputian doses, invoked by Hahnemann, is assumed rather than proved to have a real existence. The only evidence we can have that diseased parts are so sensitively alive to Homœopathic medicines is, an exaggeration or increase of the symptoms following their administration, and we are accordingly directed to give only such doses as will aggravate the state of the patient, in the slightest possible degree, in order that when the disease is overcome by them, they may offer but slight opposition to the efforts of the vital force to restore the body to a healthy condition. Now, what proof can we have that an aggravation of the symptoms, in any case of disease, is to be attributed to the medicine as its cause? Absolutely none, unless it were the nature of diseases to run their course with great uniformity in regard to the intensity of the symptoms, in

the absence of all medication. But as diseases are marked by nothing more strongly than their spontaneous exacerbations, how can we be certain that these are caused, in any instance, by the medicine that may be administered? And if there is no proof that the infinitesimals act Homœopathically, what reason is there to believe that they exercise any remedial agency whatever, in the cure of diseases? With an as succinct answer as possible to this question, we shall conclude this examination of Homœopathy; for we dare not trespass farther upon your patience by scrutinizing its psoric feature, and must be content to leave it, as we found it, infected with the *itch*, lest you be seized with the *cacoethes fugiendi* and leave us.

In attestation of the efficiency of their remedies, Homœopathists boldly appeal to the success of their practice, nay, they allege that diseases are cured by them, which had baffled the skill of a succession of Allopathic practitioners. That recoveries do take place from all manner of acute diseases, under no other than Homœopathic treatment, it were uncandid to deny, nor would truth or science be served by such denial. The fact must also be admitted that, ever and anon, diseases that have long resisted the big guns of Allopathy, and even gained ground in spite of their raking fire, have quietly retreated under the milder auspices of Homœopathy. What then? Shall the infinitesimals raise the shout of victory, and boast that it is by their might these wonders are achieved? By no means, unless it can first be shown that nature is powerless, and when invaded, must continue to groan under disease till rescued by art. So far is this from being true, that the officiousness of art is often a real hindrance to her sanative operations—sometimes a positive contravention of them. Hence, we can easily understand the apparent efficacy of the Homœopathic practice: it is, as I verily believe, a nullity—"a futility and triviality"—as Carlyle might say, and yet, by leaving nature free to act, and removing burdens sometimes injudiciously imposed by the *nimia diligentia medicorum*, it may accomplish wonders. We are justified, nevertheless, in attributing all the salutary results to nature alone, because we know they do not transcend her powers, and we do not know that the virtues of medicines are infinitely divisible; all our knowledge is, on the contrary, infinitely against such an hypothesis.

But although Homœopathic doses of medicines are nothing, absolutely nothing, and are in themselves incapable of doing either good or harm, it does not follow that those who prescribe them exert no agency whatever in the removal of disease. The rigid diet, enjoined by them, in conjunction with their remedies, together with the faith and hope inspired by their confident assurances—assurances, which are ever in the inverse ratio of knowledge—do much to enliven the sanative powers of nature and thus contribute to the removal of disease. No physician is or ought to be ignorant of the influ-

ence of the mind upon the body, in health and in disease, and to direct this influence aright is no small part of his duty, in his intercourse with the sick. At the same time, it must be admitted that he who employs this instrumentality alone, while he attaches importance to the punctual administration of *nihilities*, is a charlatan—an unconscious charlatan, if you please, provided he veritably believes in the healing virtues of his medicaments. There may be such sincere Homœopathists; but we cannot help suspecting there are some, who find themselves in the same predicament as, Cicero tells us, a certain class of religious teachers in Rome, who could never look into one another's faces without laughing.

It may be asked, if nature does the work and Homœopathists get the credit and the fee, what reason have regular physicians to suppose that their ministration is more honorable or useful? To this question it will be a sufficient answer to remind you that they deal with *realities* and not with *subtilities*, and use remedies that are capable of visibly affecting the bodies of their patients. The effects of these remedies are not unfrequently so manifest as to arrest the attention of all who observe them, nor is any one liable to confound them with the natural changes of disease. No one can persuade himself, for a moment, that *blood-letting*, *tartar emetic*, *calomel*, *opium*, *quinine*, &c., are not powerful agents, and capable of exerting a decided control over the course and events of diseases. To instance only quinine, we can certainly cure intermittent fever, by the administration of suitable doses of the remedy, while the most eminent Homœopathists in Germany admit that this disease refuses to yield to infinitesimal doses of the article; here again their corner-stone crumbles, and the superstructure is "melted into air, into thin air," disclosing "the baseless fabric of this vision" of German transcendentalism.



